Quantum oscillations without quantum coherence

V. V. Dobrovitski,[1] H. A. De Raedt,[2] M. I. Katsnelson,[3] and B. N. Harmon[1]

[1]*Ames Laboratory, Iowa State University, Ames IA 50011, USA*
[2]*Institute for Theoretical Physics and Materials Science Centre, University of Groningen, Nijenborgh 4, NL-9747 AG Groningen, The Netherlands*
[3]*Institute of Metal Physics, Ekaterinburg 620219, Russia*

We study numerically the damping of quantum oscillations and the increase of entropy with time in model spin systems decohered by a spin bath. In some experimentally relevant cases, the oscillations of considerable amplitude can persist long after the entropy has saturated near its maximum, i.e. when the system has been decohered almost completely. Therefore, the pointer states of the system demonstrate non-trivial dynamics. The oscillations exhibit slow power-law decay, rather than exponential or Gaussian, and may be observable in experiments.

PACS numbers: 03.65.Yz, 75.10.Jm, 76.60.Es, 03.65.Ta

arXiv:quant-ph/0112053v1 8 Dec 2001

For a quantum system prepared in a linear superposition of its eigenstates, some observables can oscillate with time. Interaction of the system with its environment leads to a decay of the system's initial pure state into a mixture of several "pointer states"; it causes an increase of the system's entropy (decoherence) and damping of quantum oscillations (dephasing) with time [1, 2]. Both effects, decoherence and dephasing, are often considered as equivalent results of the mixed state of the system. But careful analysis shows important differences [3, 4] originating from the fact that the same density matrix can describe both an ensemble of similar systems, and a single decohered system. Thus, e.g., dephasing can appear in an ensemble of pure, non-decohered systems with slightly differing dynamics (this is an idealized picture of T_2 processes in NMR). Decoherence and dephasing are hard to distinguish in experiments which employ ensembles of quantum systems. However, recently it has become possible to study single quantum systems, such as trapped ions [5], atoms in cavities [6], or even mesoscopically big Cooper-pair boxes [7]. As a result, theoretical consideration of the relation between dephasing and decoherence has become experimentally relevant and important.

In this work, we compare dephasing and decoherence in single systems of interacting $s = 1/2$ spins coupled to a bath of $s = 1/2$ spins. We show that in some cases, the oscillations can survive long after the entropy has almost saturated, i.e. that the quantum oscillations can take place for a long time even in an almost completely decohered system. These oscillations do not decay according to usual exponential ($\exp(-t/\tau)$) or Gaussian ($\exp(-t^2/\tau^2)$) law, but exhibit long power-law ($1/\sqrt{t}$ or $1/t$) tails. This result has interesting consequences. The standard picture of a decoherence process assumes that as soon as the system has decayed into a mixture of pointer states, the fast quantum mechanical motion is over, i.e. the pointer states are essentially static. This has been confirmed by numerous studies of different types of pointer states [1]. However, we observe that after the system has decayed into a mixture of the pointer states, and its entropy has reached maximum, the oscillations still persist. It means that the pointer states are not static: they exhibit non-trivial dynamical behavior. We show this explicitly by analyzing the structure of the density matrix. The models considered here may be relevant for a number of experimental systems [8].

Studies of the dynamics of quantum oscillations have a long history. In most situations considered so far, quantum oscillations exhibit very fast exponential or Gaussian decay (it is the main reason for the classical behavior of the world around us) [1]. Power-law-damped oscillations have been mentioned [8] for a single spin decohered by a spin bath, but the dynamics of decoherence and the structure of pointer states has not been analyzed in detail. In contrast, in this study the properties of the pointer states are of primary importance, especially for a central system containing several spins, where the non-trivial dynamics of the pointer states is even more pronounced. Generally, to our knowledge, the possibility of quantum oscillations without quantum coherence, i.e. pointer states with non-trivial dynamics, have not been discussed before.

For long-lasting oscillations, the system should be coupled weakly to the environment, and the characteristic energies of the system should be much larger than environmental ones. This situation, being less relevant for experiments or the quantum measurement problem, has not been studied in much detail. Usually, in this case (referred to as the quantum limit of decoherence [9]), the pointer states are the eigenstates $|\phi_n\rangle$ of the system's Hamiltonian. The decay of the non-diagonal elements $\langle\phi_n|\rho|\phi_m\rangle$ of the density matrix ρ is Gaussian, and its rate is linearly proportional to the magnitude of the interaction Hamiltonian [9]. However, as we show below, the quantum limit of decoherence can be more subtle.

Analytical studies of dephasing/decoherence are not always possible. In many cases, they include approximations which can be quite stringent (e.g. Markovian behavior of the bath). In this work, we solve directly

FIG. 1: Decoherence of a single spin coupled to a static bath. (a): oscillations of σ_z (top) and an increase of entropy S_e (bottom); the frequency of oscillations is very high, and individual lines of the $\sigma_z(t)$ curve merge. (b) and (c): comparison of the analytical solution (solid line) with the numerical results (dots) for the envelope of σ_z oscillations (b) and for oscillations themselves (c). In (b), most of numerical data points have been removed to make the line visible.

trace over the bath spins is equivalent to averaging over the Gaussian random field B with zero average and dispersion $b^2 \approx \sum_k J_k^2$, and for the case $\Delta \gg b$:

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_z(t) &= \frac{\sigma_z(0)}{2\pi b^2} \,\mathrm{Re} \int dB \exp\left[-2i\Delta t - iB^2 t/\Delta\right] \quad (2) \\ &\times \exp\left[-(1/2)B^2/b^2\right] \end{aligned}$$

The envelope of the $\sigma_z(t)$ oscillations is $\sigma_z^{(\mathrm{env})}(t) = \sigma_z(0)\left[1+(2t/\tau_1)^2\right]^{1/4}$, where $\tau_1 = \Delta/b^2$. Thus, initially there is the usual Gaussian damping (quadratic with time), but afterwards it changes to a slow power-law decay $1/\sqrt{2t/\tau_1}$. The analytical results for the envelope, and for the oscillations of $\sigma_z(t)$ themselves, coincide perfectly with the numerical simulations, see Fig. 1(c) and (d).

The analytical solution makes clear that the rapidness of the system's dynamics ($\Delta \gg J_k$ in our case) is needed for long-time oscillations in a decohered system. Fast motion of the system eliminates from the evolution operator the decohering terms which are of first order in the system-bath coupling B, and only second-order terms survive, as in Eq. 2. In contrast to the conclusion of Ref. [9], the decoherence remains rather fast, although the spin-bath interaction does not have diagonal elements in the σ_z basis.

We have considered above a static environment, but slow internal dynamics does not influence our qualitative conclusions. As an example, we add an external field acting on the bath spins, so the Hamiltonian of the bath becomes $\mathcal{H}_B = h_x \sum_k S_k^x$, where $h_x \ll \Delta$ (all other parameters are kept the same). The results of simulations

FIG. 3: Decoherence of two coupled spins by a spin bath. (a): oscillations of $\sigma_z^1(t)$; (b): entropy; (c): correlations between the central spins, C_{12}^{zz} (solid line), and $C_{12}^{xx} = C_{12}^{yy}$ (dashed line); (d): comparison of the numerical results for $\sigma_z^1(t)$ (dots) with analytical short-time solution (solid line) and long-time approximation (dashed line). Most of numerical data points are removed to make the lines visible.

Ref. [9], which suggest that the exact dynamics of the bath is unimportant as long as it is slow.

Finally, we study the quantum oscillations in decohered many-spin systems. In this case, we see most clearly the two stages, the first one associated with the decay of the system into a mixture of dynamical pointer states (when the entropy rises close to its maximum), and the second one, when the oscillations of the pointer states decay.

As a simple example, we consider two spins $\mathbf{s}_1$ and $\mathbf{s}_2$ with Heisenberg anisotropic coupling J between them, so that the system's Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}_0 = 2J\mathbf{s}_1\mathbf{s}_2 + J/2$. Spins are coupled to the static bath via isotropic Heisenberg exchange, $\mathcal{V} = \sum_k J_k(\mathbf{s}_1 + \mathbf{s}_2)\mathbf{S}_k$. For the simulations presented in Fig. 3, we use $J = 8.0$, and the values of the coupling constants are the same as above. The initial state of the system is the product $|\uparrow\rangle|\downarrow\rangle$, i.e. the symmetric superposition of the triplet $|s = 1, s_z = 0\rangle$ and the singlet $|s = 0\rangle$ states. We present only the oscillations of the z-component of the first spin $\sigma_1^z(t)$: oscillations of $\sigma_2^z(t)$ are just shifted in phase by π, and all other components of the central spins remain practically constant.

The results of the numerical simulations are shown in Fig. 3 (note the time scale in this case). Again, there is an initial sharp decrease of the amplitude of oscillations and an increase of entropy; moreover, the correlations $C_{12}^{\alpha\beta} = \langle\sigma_1^\alpha\sigma_2^\beta\rangle$ between the two central spins follow the behavior of the entropy supporting the conclusion about practically complete initial decoherence of the system. Nevertheless, again, the oscillations exhibit a long tail, although the entropy and the correlations has saturated. Analytical treatment of the Heisenberg case also supports

FIG. 4: Dependence of the density matrix elements vs. time. (a): diagonal elements for $|s=1, s_z=0\rangle$ state (solid line), $|s=1, s_z=\pm 1\rangle$ states (dashed line), and $|s=0\rangle$ state (dotted line); (b): nondiagonal element $\langle s=0|\rho|s=1, s_z=0\rangle$. All other matrix elements are very small.

that the quantum coherent oscillations can exist in decohered systems. The oscillations exhibit long tails which decay with time as $1/t$ or $1/\sqrt{t}$, and are observable long after the system has decayed into a mixture of pointer states. Therefore, the pointer states can exhibit nontrivial fast dynamics. We have shown this also by direct analysis of the density matrix.

The authors would like to thank A. Melikidze for helpful discussions. This work was partially carried out at the Ames Laboratory, which is operated for the U. S. Department of Energy by Iowa State University under Contract No. W-7405-82 and was supported by the Director of the Office of Science, Office of Basic Energy Research of the U. S. Department of Energy. Support from the Dutch "Stichting Nationale Computer Faciliteiten (NCF)" is gratefully acknowledged. This work was partially supported by Russian Basic Research Foundation, grant 01-02-16108.

[1] For review, see e.g. D. Giulini, E. Joos, C. Kiefer, J. Kupsch, I.-O. Stamatescu, H. D. Zeh, *Decoherence and the Appearance of a Classical World in Quantum Theory* (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, New York, 1996).

[2] A. J. Leggett, S. Chakravarty, A. T. Dorsey, M. P. A. Fisher, A. Garg, and W. Zwerger, Rev. Mod. Phys. **59**, 1 (1987).

[3] We use the term "dephasing" for the decay of quantum oscillations, and "decoherence" for the increase of entropy. However, this terminology is not common, and varies in different papers, see also, W. H. Zurek, quant-ph/0105127 and references therein.

[4] H. D. Zeh, "The Meaning of Decoherence", in: *Decoherence: Theoretical, Experimental, and Conceptual problems*, Ph. Blanchard, D. Giulini, E. Joos, C. Kiefer, I.-O. Stamatescu (eds.) (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, New York, 2000).

[5] C. Monroe, D. M. Meekhof, B. E. King, W. M. Itano, and D. J. Wineland, Phys. Rev. Lett. **75**, 4714 (1995).

[6] Q. A. Turchette, C. J. Hood, W. Lange, H. Mabuchi, and H. J. Kimble, Phys. Rev. Lett. **75**, 4710 (1995).

[7] Y. Nakamura, Yu. A. Pashkin, and J. S. Tsai, Nature **398**, 786 (1999); cond-mat/0111402.

[8] N. V. Prokof'ev and P. C. E. Stamp, Rep. Prog. Phys. **63**, 669 (2000); N. V. Prokof'ev and P. C. E. Stamp, cond-mat/0006054.

[9] J. P. Paz and W. H. Zurek, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 5181 (1999).

[10] H. A. De Raedt, A. Hams, K. Michielsen, and K. De Raedt, Comp. Phys. Comm. **132**, 1 (2000).

[11] J. S. Waugh, "Average Hamiltonian theory", in *Encyclopedia of magnetic resonance*, D. M. Grant, and R. K. Harris (eds.) (J. Wiley and Sons, New York, 1996).

[12] N. D. Mermin, Physica A **177**, 561 (1991).

[13] P. Zanardi, Phys. Rev. A **57**, 3276 (1998).

[14] D. A. Lidar, D. Bacon, J. Kempe, K. B. Whaley, Phys. Rev. A **63**, 022306 (2001).